

**To:** CN=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]  
**Cc:** CN=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]  
**Bcc:** []  
**From:** CN=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US  
**Sent:** Wed 3/31/2010 10:31:13 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Fw: Preferred Purpose Statement  
<http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html>  
<http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/organizations/cespk-co/regulatory/index.html>  
<mailto:Melanie.Rowland@noaa.gov>

Hmmmm, so why can't we say "I agree" in email like Mike Jewell did? We support the better purpose statement, next topic! :).

Seriously, though, how/when do we push it? And why would we have to if DOI agrees to it now?

\*\*\*\*\*

Erin Foresman  
US EPA Region 9  
1325 J Street, 14th floor  
C/O Army Corps of Engineers  
Sacramento, CA 95814-2922  
(916) 557 5253

-----Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Erin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US  
Date: 03/31/2010 03:08PM  
cc: Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
Subject: Re: Fw: Preferred Purpose Statement

One additional factoid.

I talked to David Nawi about this yesterday, and to Melanie Rowland (NMFS) today. There seems to be a bit of a disconnect between the two of them as to what the next step will be. David seemed to think that we will, at some unspecified time, pass our federal thoughts on to the BDCP EIS/EIR process. Melanie did not think that would happen absent some push by EPA. So I have another call into David to see where this really stands.

It may be that EPA will have to push this issue again, in some forum.,

Erin Foresman---03/31/2010 02:55:26 PM---Have we replied to the corps and DOI on this? Tom and I had a chance to discuss it and are supporti

From: Erin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US  
To: Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
Cc: Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 03/31/2010 02:55 PM  
Subject: Re: Fw: Preferred Purpose Statement

Have we replied to the corps and DOI on this? Tom and I had a chance to discuss it and are supportive on this purpose statement.

\*\*\*\*\*

Erin Foresman  
US EPA Region 9  
1325 J Street, 14th floor  
C/O Army Corps of Engineers  
Sacramento, CA 95814-2922  
(916) 557 5253

-----Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Erin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US  
Date: 03/17/2010 06:32PM  
Subject: Fw: Preferred Purpose Statement

I'm on blackberry so haven't looked at attachment.  
Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

----- Original Message -----

From: "Jewell, Michael S SPK" [Michael.S.Jewell@usace.army.mil]  
Sent: 03/17/2010 11:03 AM MST  
To: <Melanie.Rowland@noaa.gov>  
Cc: "Nawi, David" <David\_Nawi@ios.doi.gov>; "Allen, Kaylee" <Kaylee.Allen@sol.doi.gov>; "Castleberry, Dan" <dan\_castleberry@fws.gov>; "Grim, Mary" <Mary\_Grim@fws.gov>; "Idlof, Patricia S" <Pidlof@usbr.gov>; "Milligan, Ronald E" <RMilligan@usbr.gov>; "Barajas, Federico" <FBarajas@usbr.gov>; <Maria.Rea@noaa.gov>; "Mike Tucker" <Michael.Tucker@NOAA.GOV>; "Jim Monroe" <james.monroe@sol.doi.gov>; "Nepstad, Michael G SPK" <Michael.G.Nepstad@usace.army.mil>; Karen Schwinn  
Subject: RE: Preferred Purpose Statement

Melanie:

Thanks. The Corps is in agreement with your edit on the final element of the purpose statement.

I'm Ccing Karen Schwinn at EPA on this too.

Michael S Jewell  
Chief, Regulatory Division  
US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District  
1325 J Street, Room 1480  
Sacramento, California 95814  
O:(916) 557-6605 F:(916) 557-6877  
michael.s.jewell@usace.army.mil

Want to let us know how we're doing?  
<http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html>

Need information on the Regulatory Program?

<http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/organizations/cespk-co/regulatory/index.html>

-----Original Message-----

From: Melanie Rowland [mailto:Melanie.Rowland@noaa.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 10:22 AM

To: Nawi, David; Allen, Kaylee; Castleberry, Dan; Grim, Mary; Idlof, Patricia S; Milligan, Ronald E; Barajas, Federico; Maria.Rea@noaa.gov; Mike Tucker; Jim Monroe; Jewell, Michael S SPK

Subject: Preferred Purpose Statement

At David's request at our meeting yesterday, I did a little editing of the purpose statement we ended up with at the five federal agencies meeting on March 10 (convened by the Corps). This "preferred NEPA purpose statement" would be ready in case the NGOs' request to bring the P&N discussion to the Steering Committee results reopening of the discussion and a request for the federal co-lead agencies' preferred purpose statement. As you'll see, my only substantive edit is to delete "up to full contract amount" and accompanying phrases in the last purpose. We concluded yesterday that while we're all OK with the existing language, if the opportunity arises to express our preference, our preference is to go back to the language we originally drafted before negotiations with the PRE's led to the modified statement.

I started with the statement from the "final minutes of the 3-10-2010 meeting," sent out by Mike Jewell yesterday. My edits are shown in track changes in the attached document.

Melanie

[attachment "Preferred NEPA Purpose Statement drft 3-17-10.doc" removed by Erin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US]